

MYSORE HOUSING BOARD BILL, 1954.

Motion to consider.—(contd.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now consideration of the Mysore Housing Board Bill.

* ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ-ಹೊನ್ನನಗರ).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಬಿಲ್, 1954, ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ತುಂಬ ಗೌರವಯುತವಾದುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು 1954-55 ನೆಯ ಸಾಲಿನ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಅಂದಾಜನ್ನು ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡುವಾಗ ಗೃಹಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಭಾಷಣದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರತಿಯು 26ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ:

“ಆಹಾರವೂ ಮತ್ತು ಮನೆಯೂ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಗಳು. ಒಂದು ಮನುಷ್ಯನ ಸ್ಥಿತವಾದ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಗೃಹಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೊದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಅನಾರೋಗ್ಯಕರವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ವಾಸಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಥಳವಿಲ್ಲದಂಥ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಮನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಕೊಂಡು ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಈಡಾಗಿರುವವರು ಬಡವರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ವರ್ಗದವರೂ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಕೆಳ ದರ್ಜೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದು ಯುಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಭಾವಿಸಿದರು. ಅದರ ದೆಸೆಯಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು, ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ವರ್ಗದವರಿಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಗೃಹ ವಸತಿಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲು 1949ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನೊದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಕ್ಟನ್ನು ವಿಧಾಯಕ ಮಾಡಿದರು. 1952ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಈಗಿನ ಸಚಿವ ಮಂಡಲಿಯವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಆ ಅಕ್ಟಿನ ನಿಯಮವನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಯಿತು. ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನೊದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಲಾಯಿತು, ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯು ತನ್ನ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದೆ. ಈ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಭಾರತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸಹಾಯ ದ್ರವ್ಯ ಪೋಷಿತವಾದ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದರು. ಉಭಯ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಒಂದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದೇ ಹೋಯಿತು”

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I just know from what book the member is reading?

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—I am reading from the Chief Minister's Budget speech of 6th March 1954.

“ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಸಮಾಲೋಚನೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವ ನಂತರ, ಆ ಎರಡು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟುಗೂಡಿಸಿ ಸೌಹಾರ್ದದಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸುವಂತೆ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಭಾರತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ‘ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯಲ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್’ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಮೇರೆಗೆ, ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವೆಚ್ಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇಕಡಾ 50ರಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಸಹಾಯ ದ್ರವ್ಯವಾಗಿಯೂ ಮತ್ತು ಉಳಿದೆ ಸೇಕಡಾ 50ರಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಸಾಲವನ್ನಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಭದ್ರಾವತಿ, ಮಂಡ್ಯ, ದಾವಣಗೆರೆ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ತಿರುಮಕೂಡ, ನರಸೀಪುರ—ಈ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 42,00,560 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಒಟ್ಟು ವೆಚ್ಚದಲ್ಲಿ 1,588 ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನೂರೈವತ್ತು ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಮುಗಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಇತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲಸವು ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಕೆಲಸವು ಇನ್ನೂ ತ್ವರಿತವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು. 22,25,440 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಅಂದಾಜು ವೆಚ್ಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ರಾಜಾಜಿನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ 700 ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಯೋಜನೆಯೊಂದನ್ನು ಭಾರತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಾವು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ದೇಹದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆನ್ನುಮೂಳೆಯು ಎಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾನವನ್ನು ಮಧ್ಯಮ ವರ್ಗದವರು ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಡೆದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬ ನಾಣ್ಯದಿಯು ಇದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. ಆವರಿಗೆ ಗೃಹ ವಸತಿಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೂ ಹೌದು ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯವೂ ಹೌದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಮಧ್ಯಮ ತರಗತಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು “ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್”ನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವುಳ್ಳವರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ನವರು, ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ವರ್ಗದವರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಮಧ್ಯಮ ತರಗತಿಯವರಿಗೂ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿಕೊಡುವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮನೋದಾಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ; ಮತ್ತು ಅದನ್ನು ಸದ್ಯದಲ್ಲೆಯೇ ವಿಧಾನ ಮಂಡಲದವರ ಮುಂದಿಡಲಾಗುವುದು.”

ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಈಗ ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರವೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಇಡೀ ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿ ವಸತಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ, ಬಡವರು, ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ವರ್ಗದವರು ಮತ್ತು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಮಾಡುವ ರೈತರು—ಇವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ವಸತಿ ಗೃಹಗಳಲ್ಲದೆ ಬಹು ಕಷ್ಟ ಜೀವನವನ್ನು

ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇಡೀ ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾತ್ರವೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಇತರರೂ ಈ ವಸತಿ ಸೌಕರ್ಯದ ಬಿಕ್ಕಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಮಹಾ ಕಾರ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಈ ದಿಕ್ಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೂ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ನಡೆದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಗಳೂ ನಡೆದಿವೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಗತಿಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಗೃಹ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಕಾರ್ಯ ತ್ವಷ್ಟಿಕರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ಸಹ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಮನದಟ್ಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶದ ಹಲವಾರು ಯೋಜನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ pre-fabricated houses ಗಾಗಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿರುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೂ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಈ ಗೃಹಗಳ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಮನಗಂಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಮನೋದಯವನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದಿಂದ, ಈ ರಚನೆಯ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಂದೇಹವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಭಾಷಣಕಾರರೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಸಂದೇಹವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮುಗ್ಗಟ್ಟಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಇವೊತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ವೇದ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಹಣದ ಕೊರತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನುಮಾರು ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ವೆಚ್ಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟೇನೂ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನಗಿನ್ನುತ್ತದೆ.

1 P.M.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಈಗ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇವೆ. ಆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿನ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹವನ್ನು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಆ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೌಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಅದು ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಬರೀ ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಒಳಗೆ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವವರಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿದರು. ಅಂಥ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ನೀಡಬಹುದು. ಅವರು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಕೊರತೆಯಿಂದಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಕಡಿಮೆ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ನೀಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸುವ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ದ್ವಿಸ್ತಿಕಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ, ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ, ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ, ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ವಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವರು ತಾತ್ಕಾಲಿಕವಾಗಿ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಹಾಲ ಕೆಲವು ಕೊರತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಗಲಾಡಿಸಬಹುದು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಾವಾಗಿಯೇ ವಸತಿ

ಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರದೇಶದಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಹೆಡ್ ಕ್ವಾರ್ಟರ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಹಳ್ಳಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ, ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಏಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಹೆಡ್ ಕ್ವಾರ್ಟರ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಸಹ ಮನೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಅವರು ತೊಂದರೆಗೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಿರುವುದು ಉಂಟು. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಂಥ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮನೆಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಓಡಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊನೆಯಪಕ್ಷ ತಮ್ಮ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ನೌಕರರಿಗೂ ಬೇಕಾಗತಕ್ಕ, ಅವರವರ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಹಾಗಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಬೃಹತ್ ಯೋಜನೆ ಯನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಗಳೂ ನಡೆದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬೃಹತ್ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ರಚನೆಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾವಯಾವ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶುದ್ಧವಾದದ್ದಕ್ಕೂ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅನಂತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಒದಗಿಬಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿ ಅಕ್ವೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು, ಕಾಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟ್ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು, ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸುವುದು ಇವು ಆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಬಹಳ ಮುಂದಿನ ದೂರದ ಒಂದು ಆಶೆ, ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಮೈಸೂರ್ ರೇಬರ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಇದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನೂ ಸಮನ್ವಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಬೇರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅವುಗಳ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ನೂಟಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರುಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಅನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾಮಕರಣ ನಡೆಸಲು 7 ಜನ ನಡೆಸಲು ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ಅದು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಡಿಸಾರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಕೂಡ ಈ ಮನೋದೇಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೂಟಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಡಿಸಾರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೇ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗಲೇ ಅವರು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ನೆರವೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಹಣಕಾಸು ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಬರೀ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು, ಆ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು, ಅದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಎಂತಾದ ಹೊಸ ಗೃಹಗಳ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ಈ ಒಂದು ಸದುದ್ದೇಶ ಈಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಈ ಮನೋದೇಯವನ್ನು ತಂದು ಈಗ ಕೆಲಸ

(SRI S. GOPALA GOWDA.)

ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತಷ್ಟು ಮೊಟಕು ಮಾಡುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವೂ ಕೂಡ ಸ್ವತಃ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡದೆ, dog in the manger ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಅಂದರೆ, ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಇದೆ, ಅದೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಮಾಡುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವರು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣಕಾಸು ಇಲ್ಲ, ತೊಂದರೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದಾದರೆ ಉಪಯೋಗವೇನಾಯಿತು? ಈ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕೆಲಸ ಅಥವಾ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಏಕೆ ಬಂತು ಅಂದರೆ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿತ್ತು, ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯ, ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲರ ತಕ್ಕ ವಸತಿಗೃಹಗಳ ಕೊರತೆಯನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದಿದೆ, ಆ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ—ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಮಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷ ಮುಗಿದು ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯ ವರ್ಷ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲನೆ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆ ಮುಗಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ಇನ್ನೂ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಯಾವಯಾವ ಕಾನೂನು ಕಾಯಿದೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು, ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಮಾತು. ಪಾಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಲ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕಾನೂನು ಕಾಯಿದೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಬರುವುದಾದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅದನ್ನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಕಾನೂನು ಕಾಯಿದೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆ ಕೊನೆ ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಬಂದುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ತಡವಾಗಿಯೇ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮನೋದ ಮತ್ತು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಲ ತರಬೇಕು, ಹೊಸ ಕಂದಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು, ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಯೋಜನೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಲ ಮತ್ತು ಹೊಸ ಕಂದಾಯಗಳು ಬರದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಆ ಯೋಜನೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಣ ಕೂಡ ವ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗುವ ಸಂಭವ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ತಿಳಿದೂ ಕೂಡ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವೂ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೈಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಆ ಕ್ಷಣವೇ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಲಕ್ಷ ಗಟ್ಟಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿರ್ಧರಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಮನೋದ ಬಹಳ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದರು. ನಿಜ, ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ

ಹಣ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹಣ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಈ ಪ್ರಾಂತೀಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿನ ಹಣ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಆ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿಯೇ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನೀವು 10 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ನಾವು 10 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಒಂದು ಪದ್ಧತಿ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ರೋಯಲ್ ಮಿಡ್ಲ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಮಿಡ್ಲ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ನವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಸತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದು ಇರಲಿ, ಯಾರು ಇವೊತ್ತು ಭದ್ರಾವತಿ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ K.G.F. ಮತ್ತು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ದುಡಿಯತಕ್ಕವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಸತಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಈಗ 2-3 ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ರೇಬರ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬಿಲ್ಡನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ರೇಬರ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಆಕ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲಾರದೇ ಹೋಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಆ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕ ವರ್ಗದವರಿಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಗೃಹ ವಸತಿಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲು 1949 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನೊದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಆಕ್ಟನ್ನು ವಿಧಾಯಕ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದು 1949 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಿಂದ 52ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಆಯಿತು, ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಸೊರತು ಕಾರ್ಯ ನಡೆದದ್ದು 1952ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ. ಈಗಿನ ಸಚಿವ ಮಂಡಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಆ ಆಕ್ಟನ್ನು, ಅದರ ನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಯಿತು. ಆದರೆ ವಸ್ತುಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಸತಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಎಂದರೆ 150 ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ತಾವು con-templete ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಯೋಜನೆ ಎಂಥ ಭಾರಿ ಯೋಜನೆ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಒದಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಯೋಜನೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನೂ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು: “ಸರಿ, ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ನ್ಯಾಯವೇ; ಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲರ ತಕ್ಕ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಇದ್ದಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ಮೈಸೂರು, ದಾವಣಗೆರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥಾ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳ ಗತಿ ಏನು? ಮನೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲ?” ಎಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಮನೆಗಳ ಕೊರತೆ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿದೆ, ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಕೊರತೆ ಇದೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮನೆಗಳ ಕೊರತೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧರಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಕೇಂದ್ರದಿಂದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಂದು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಸಹಾಯ ಆದೀತು ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ ನಿಜ. ಆದರೆ

ಕಾರ್ಯತಃ ಇದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂದೇಹ ಖಚಿತವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನೂ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕ್ಲಾಂತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Execution of contracts.—(1) Every contract shall be made on behalf of the Board by the Chairman :

Provided that (a) no contract involving an expenditure of rupees five lakhs and more shall be made without the previous sanction of the State Government ;

(b) (i) no contract involving an expenditure of rupees twenty-five thousand and more shall, subject to clause (a), be made without the previous sanction of the Board.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಂದು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇವರಿಬ್ಬರೂ ಸೇರಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದು, ಅನೇಕ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕೊನೆ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಅವು ತಮ್ಮ ವಿವಾದಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮುಂದೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಾವೂ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡದೆ ಅಥವಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ಅಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಬಹುದು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚರಾಯಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವಾಗ, ಅನೇಕವೇಳೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗುವಾಗ, ಯಾರು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಸೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ಅವರಿಂದ ದೂರ ಸರಿದು ಕೆಲಸ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅನೇಕವೇಳೆ ನಾವು ಕೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಗೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ವಾಗ್ವಾದ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಏನೇ ಕೇಳಲಿ ಹಂಚಿಕೆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾದ ಸಂಗತಿ ತಿಳಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಕೆಲವು ವೇಳೆ ಪರಸ್ಪರವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದ ಹೋರಾಟ ನಡೆಯುವುದುಂಟು. ಏನೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ರಚನೆ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ತೀವ್ರಾಸಕ್ತಿಯುಳ್ಳವರಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಒಂದುಕಡೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೋ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತೆ ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂಥ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕಿರಲಾರದು. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಅಷ್ಟು ದೂರ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿದ್ದರೂ, ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒತ್ತಾಯವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವೇನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದುವರೆಗಿರುವವರು ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಕಾಲ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ಅಂಥವರಿಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ರಚನೆಯಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಈಗಿರುವ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗ ಅಷ್ಟು ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Central Government have given 14 lakhs.

L.A.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—Yes, Sir. ಅದಕ್ಕೇ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ 14 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು

Mr. SPEAKER.—Nearly half of it is granted.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈಗಿರುವ ಯೋಜನೆ ನಾವೇನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣ ಬೇಕು, ಅದನ್ನು ಮಿತವ್ಯಯದಿಂದ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಬಹುಶಃ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕೊಡದಿರಲಾರದು. ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಸ್ವಾಚ್ಛಾಟರಿಬಾಡಿಯನ್ನು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೂ ಸಹ, ವಸತಿ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನೊದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ನಮಗೆ ಹಣ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿ ಇದರ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಒಂದು ಬೃಹತ್ ಯೋಜನೆ ತಯಾರಿಸಿ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮನೆಗಳ ತೊಂದರೆ, ವಸತಿಯ ಕೊರತೆ ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾರ್ಥಕವಾಗಲಾರದು, ಈಗಿರುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಈಡೇರಲಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಅನುಮಾನಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಮೇರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಫಂಡ್ಸ್ ಎಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು 55ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ:

“(1) The Board shall have its own fund.

(2) The Board may accept grants.”

ಈ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಬರುವ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು.

“Subventions, donations and gifts from Central Government or State Government or a local authority or any individual or body, whether incorporated or not, for all or any of the purposes of this Act.

“(3) The State Government shall, every year, make a grant to the Board of a sum equivalent to the administrative expenses of the Board.”

ಅವರು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಲಿ, ಮಾಡದಿರಲಿ ಇದುವಾತ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ತಲೆಗೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು. ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷವೂ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವು ಹಣ ಒದಗಿಸಲೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

“All moneys received by or on behalf of the Board by virtue of this Act, all proceeds of land or any other kind of property sold by the Board, all rents, betterment

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.)

charges and all interest, profits and other moneys accruing to the Board shall constitute the fund of the Board."

ಇದು ಈ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಟರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫಾರ್ಜಸ್ ಎಷಯವೇನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಮನಿಯಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಬೆಟರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫಾರ್ಜಸ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿದಾಗ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ನಿವೇಶನದ ಬೆಲೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು, ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಬೆಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಅದರ ಮಾಲೀಕರಿಂದ ಬೆಟರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫಾರ್ಜಸ್ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡುವುದು ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯ? ಇದರಿಂದ ಜನರಿಗೂ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರಿಗೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯುಂಟಾಗಬಹುದು. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವರದಿ ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಾಲ ಬೇಕು, ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಂಥ ಹಾನಿಯೇನೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಯೋಜನೆ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಗೊಳಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಏನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ನೀವು ಕೈಕೊಂಡರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ಕೈಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿದರೆ ಗೃಹವಸತಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈಗಕೆಲವು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನೇ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದರಿಂದ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಫಲ ದೊರೆಯಲಾರದು. ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಇದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಹರಿಜನರಿಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಎಷಯವಾಗಿಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು, ಮನೆ ನಿವೇಶನ ಆರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು, ಆಮೇಲೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವ ರೀತಿನೀತಿ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಬಹಳ ಶೋಚನೀಯವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಉನ್ನತಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೂ ತೆರೆಗೊಂದು ಮುಲ್ಗೆ ಹೂ ಇದ್ದಹಾಗೆ ಹೆಂಟಿನ ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಲು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಲು ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯಿದ್ದರೂ ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಸಹ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತದೆ; ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಯೋಜನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಹಣ ಹಂಚುವಾಗ ಮತ್ತು ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ವಸತಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣಕಾರ್ಯ ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಯೋಜನೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗೇನೊಂದು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಅಥವಾ ಹಣವೆಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಮನೆಗಳ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಷ್ಟೋವೇಳೆ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಆಗಿರುವ ತೊಂದರೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸಕಾಲ

ದಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮನೆ ಅರ್ಧ ಕಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಜೂನ್ ಹತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ಮಳೆ ಬಂದೇ ತೀರಬೇಕು. ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಜಾಗೃತ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮಳೆ ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕಾಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, ಬಂದುದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿದ ಮನೆಗಳು ಬದ್ಧ ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದು ವಾಪಸು ಬರುವ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಅವಧಿ ಮುಗಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಆಗ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತಮಾಡುವವರು ಬರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ. ಆಗ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಸರಿಯುವೆಂದು ರದ್ದು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು; ಈ ತೊಂದರೆಯಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗಿರುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೀ ಹರಿಜನರಿಗೆ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಇನ್ನೂ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ನೆರವೇರಿನುವಾಗ ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ, ಅನೇಕರು ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹರಿಜನರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮನೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹರಿಜನರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವ ನಿರ್ದರ್ಶನಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸಗಣೆ ಬಾಚುವುದಾದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಗದ್ದೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಮನೆ, ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮನೆಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಹೋಗು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಿದೆ. ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಲಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಚಲಾಯಿಸುವಾಗ ಈಗ ಅದೊಂದು ಆಯುಧವಾದರೆ ಈ ಯೋಜನೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗಾಗಬಾರದು. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆಯ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೂದೆ, ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಇದು ನಮ್ಮದೇ, ನಮಗಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕು. ನಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಜನರಲ್ಲುಂಟಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಎಲ್ಲೆಂದರೋ ಹಣ ತಂದು ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಹಣ ಜನರದು, ಜನರಿಗಾಗಿಯೇ ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದು, ಇದಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಎರುವುದು, ನಾವು ಬೇರೆಯಲ್ಲ, ಅವರು ಬೇರೆಯಲ್ಲ, ನಾವು ನಾವೇ ಇರುವುದು ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಜನತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವವರೆಗೆ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ದೊರೆಯಲಾರದು. ಈಗ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ತುರುತು, ಲಗತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ತಮಗೆ ಹಣದ ಕೊರತೆ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ಒಮ್ಮೆಗೇ ತಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೊತ್ತುಕೊಂಡು ವರ್ಷ ವರ್ಷ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಸಾಕಿಸಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಹ ಏಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಸಮಯೋಚಿತವಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವನ್ನು ಸಹ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒದಗಿಸಬಹುದು, ಈಗ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ವಸತಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಕೆಲಸ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಲು ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—Sir, the debate on this Housing Board Bill has proceeded for three days and I find that surprisingly enough and somewhat unusually, there seems to be a

considerable amount of agreement between the views expressed by various Hon'ble Members of this House and the views which I should have myself expressed, if I had spoken earlier on this Bill.

[SRI K. PRABHAKAR in the Chair]

Sir, I must associate myself in particular with the views expressed by the Hon'ble Member Sri Mascarenhas who spoke earlier on this Bill and generally also with the views expressed by my friend the Hon'ble Member Sri Bheemappa Naik and more especially with the views expressed by the last speaker, the Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda. This Housing Board Bill is an exceedingly well-intentioned measure; there is absolutely no doubt about it; and though my esteemed friend the Hon'ble the Law Minister may smile at it, I may assure him I am one of those who welcome this measure. While I am in agreement with many of the views expressed by Sri Gopala Gowda, I cannot agree with him when he says that Government must withdraw this Bill and go slow with their plans for the solution of the housing problem in Mysore State. With these prefatory remarks, Sir, I shall launch upon my observations.

1-30 P.M.

To me it seems that the general scheme of this Housing Board Bill is an attempt on the part of the State Government to bite off more than the Government can chew. They have set before themselves in the general scheme of this Bill an ambition so large in concept and so expensive for its implementation that I really do not know why the Government should have troubled themselves to insert clause 78 of this Bill which provides for the particular manner in which this Board is to be dissolved. Do the Government seriously imagine that with the largest measure of assistance from the Central Government and with the largest measure of support for the schemes which this Housing Board may undertake on the part of the general public and local bodies and everybody concerned, do the Government conceive that even the fringe of the problem of

housing the houseless could be solved or would be solved in any reasonable number of years of time? Therefore, Sir, clause 78 appears to me to be a most ominous indication of the Government's conception of how the Housing Board is expected to function during the years in which the Government will let it live and function.

The other day my friend, the Hon'ble Member Sri D. Venkatesh whose intimate acquaintance with and knowledge of the problems of labour housing are acknowledged by every section of the House, and in particular by myself, did make a reference when he spoke on this Bill to many of the objectionable features of the Housing Board Bill in so far as they detract from the usefulness of the present Labour Housing Act of 1949, which provides for the setting up of a Labour Housing Corporation whose main and exclusive business is to occupy itself with schemes of housing the industrial labour in Mysore State. The schedule to this Housing Board Bill which gives an indication of the various amendments which Government consider it desirable and necessary to make in the Labour Housing Act of 1949 is worth examination in detail because it will enable us and the Government to know how and in what respect the Housing Board Bill falls short of the provisions which have already been made for solving to some extent the problem of labour housing.

Sir, on page 30 of this Bill which contains the proposed amendments to the Mysore Labour Housing Act of 1949, item No. 5 says :

“The heading above section 5, sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15 and the heading above section 16 shall be omitted.”

Now it would be very useful to know exactly what is sought to be deleted from the Mysore Labour Housing Act of 1949. Clause 5 provides for the establishment and incorporation of the Mysore Labour Housing Corporation. In so far as the Housing Board Bill proposes to substitute the Housing Board itself for the Labour Housing Corporation, the deletion of section 5 of the Mysore Labour Housing

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

Act would be unexceptionable. But sub-section (2) of section 5 of that Act which provides for the representation of particular interests in the Corporation set up under that section, if omitted, would mean a setback in the satisfactoriness of the composition of the Housing Board itself, after it has been set up and after it has been charged with the duty of carrying out the functions for which the Labour Housing Corporation is now responsible. Sub-section (2) of section 5 says:

“(2) The Corporation shall consist of members representing the Government, employers and employees and shall be of such number and chosen in such manner as may be prescribed, but at least one member shall be a woman. The Corporation shall have a Chairman whose appointment shall be subject to the approval of the Government.”

Though the section may be omitted because a separate Labour Housing Corporation may not be considered necessary because the Housing Board itself will undertake schemes of housing industrial labour, it cannot be said that what is contained in sub-section (2) of section 5 regarding the manner in which the Corporation shall be constituted has also been provided for in clause 6 of this Housing Board Bill. Clause 6 has been read on the floor of this House by more than one Hon'ble Member. But it seems to me that clause 6 will bear another reading and I shall crave the indulgence of the House to read it once again.

“The Board shall consist of the Chairman and six other members appointed by the State Government.”

That is how the Board is to be constituted. It is just possible that Government may be expected and, if I may say so, trusted to ensure that in the constitution of the Housing Board the various interests, more especially the interests of the houseless, will be safeguarded by the appointment of some persons whom Government might

consider duly qualified and as possessing adequate representative capacity to speak for other employees as well as industrial labour. But I should say, and I am sure many Hon'ble Members of this House and my friend the Hon'ble the Law Minister himself will agree, that it is much better that clause 6 is re-drafted so as to make statutory provision for the representation of the interests not merely of industrial labour or of industrial employers but also of the various other groups and interests for whose amelioration and betterment this Bill is designed. The Statement of Objects and Reasons on page 33 of this Bill makes a very interesting reference in this particular sentence.

“The housing problem has become acute in the case of the lower middle classes and other low income groups of the population in rural and urban areas and the solution of this problem is as urgent as that of the population employed in industries. It is difficult to fit the working of the provisions of the Mysore Labour Housing Act into the subsidised Industrial Housing Schemes of the Government of India under the Five-Year Plan, which offers many advantages and is more advantageous to employers, to the State Government and to labour.”

This particular reference to the acuteness of the housing problem in the case of the lower middle classes and other low income groups of the population in the rural and urban areas opens up such a large vista that the size of the scheme for housing the houseless assumes proportions which may well appear to be beyond the large resources of even the Central Government. Sir, my friend the Law Minister in his capacity as Minister for Labour would be knowing to what extent the Labour Housing Corporation itself, since the day on which it was constituted, may be a period of 4 years by now or a little less, has been able to provide, without being otherwise pre-occupied with and distracted by the demands of the lower middle classes or

the low income groups from rural areas, housing accommodation for industrial labour as such in the city of Bangalore and other areas where these schemes have been undertaken. I am afraid the actual performance has been very inconsiderable. I do not mean to cast any reflection upon the achievements of the Corporation. But I make reference to this in order to stress the size of the problem and our approach towards the solution of the problem even though we are in no doubt as to the size of it. The manner in which this Bill provides for the dissolution of the Board by enabling the Government to put an end to the existence of the Board by means of a notification in the official Gazette after a resolution to that effect has been carried by the Legislative Assembly, gives me the impression that we have been not quite realistic in our approach to the task which this Housing Board will be called upon to undertake and should be expected to undertake. The Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda was referring to the manner in which Harijan housing schemes are being undertaken by the Government and to the general disabilities of the Government and all other agencies which undertake this extremely onerous task.

Before I go on to deal with the problem of housing the Harijans, I should like to make one more observation respecting the clause upon which I was making these observations, namely, clause 78 of the Bill regarding dissolution of the Board. It seems to me, Sir, that the Board which has been brought into existence by an Act of the Legislature may not be liable to be dissolved by a mere resolution to that effect carried by the Assembly or by a notification in the official Gazette by the Government in pursuance of such resolution. I am very sceptical, in fact I am very doubtful whether it would be possible thus to put an end to the existence of the Housing Board which will be a statutory body brought into being by the enactment of a statute according to the procedure for enacting law laid down in the various provisions of the Constitution; and it

seems to me that any attempt to short-circuit the usual course of legislative process in order to bring about a result so dear to the heart of my friend the Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda, namely, the repeal of the Housing Board Act or the dissolution of the Board, even for achieving such a purpose, this short-circuiting of the process of legislation must be avoided and I do hope that clause 78 will be taken out of the Bill when the Bill goes before the Select Committee.

If, as Government envisage, the Housing Board should undertake schemes of housing for industrial labour and for the lower middle classes and low income-groups in the rural and urban areas in the State, the composition of the Board under clause 6 of this Bill must be amplified so as to make it clear that Government will provide for due representation of the lower middle classes for whom housing schemes will be improvised and the low income groups for whom housing schemes will be provided and in particular for industrial labour for whom this Housing Board will hereafter supersede the Labour Housing Corporation which is at present in existence. Clause 6 must be suitably modified and enlarged so as to make adequate provision for the representation of the various interests on whose behalf Government's sympathetic consideration is evoked and Government commitment for incurring a considerable expenditure has been made. Then, Sir, if this Housing Scheme is to be as broad-based as the Bill would seem to make it appear, I should think that Government would be well-advised to distribute the execution of the scheme among various sectional agencies. They might, in my opinion, allow the Mysore Labour Housing Corporation to continue to deal with the task of providing housing for industrial labour; and they might, in my opinion, also continue to provide such assistance as they can to the other Corporation which has been established for enabling house-building co-operative societies to provide assistance by way of loan to those who undertake to build houses

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

whether for themselves or any others. This business of providing houses is such a large undertaking that any amount of decentralisation in the administration of the scheme is bound to produce only good results and perhaps better results than a centralised undertaking might produce. I have no desire to damp the enthusiasm of the Government in the ambitious programme that they have set before themselves. But, I am sure, most of the Hon'ble Members who have spoken already have doubted the practicability of Government being in a position even to touch the fringe of this problem in the course of many years. That being so, I should think that much is to be lost by setting up a kind of monopolist body whose business and whose exclusive business it will be to take up housing schemes of various kinds for industrial labour, for rural and urban middle classes and low income groups. The requirements of housing are as varied as the masses who constitute the population of the State. The requirements of labour housing schemes are in many important respects vitally different from the requirements of rural housing schemes and even in respect of rural housing schemes, the requirements would vary from region to region and what may be regarded as adequate provision in Maidan areas cannot be said to be adequate or sufficient in the Malnad regions. A thatched shed might do by way of a house for a houseless person in the rural parts in the Maidan. A thatched shed may afford no protection whatever against inclemencies of the weather in the Malnad parts. And therefore, varied as the requirements of housing schemes are both in regard to rural and urban areas, it would be necessary to provide for a variety of agencies which can be trusted to undertake this huge task and undertake specified tasks in specified areas for specified purposes. The more we limit the functions of these agencies, the better will they be able to function. It would be giving an almost unlimited authority to the Housing Board to entrust

it with the powers necessary for providing housing for all manner of people and for all manner of purposes. Whatever may be the basis for the thesis set out in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that the acuteness of the problem is no less in rural areas than in the case of industrial areas—whatever may be the basis for that assertion, it does seem to me that the acuteness derives from other factors in industrial areas and especially in urban areas. An illustration would make my meaning more clear and specific to my friend the Hon'ble the Law Minister. A houseless person in a village can somehow secure half-a-dozen cocoanut palm-leaves and improvise some sort of shelter for himself on some land, probably waste land belonging to Government. A houseless person in an industrial area especially in a city like Bangalore or any other urban area, would not be able to do anything of the kind. He must live where residence has been permitted or he must live on the pavements. The municipal authorities will not permit the houseless person in the City of Bangalore or in any urban area, as a matter of fact no municipal authority will permit the houseless person, to put up a residence wherever he pleases or improvise a roofing over his head and call it his residence. They would pull it down and prosecute him for encroachment of a pavement or of a public street. That is an index of the different kind of acuteness in respect of the problem of industrial housing that would prevail in the urban areas.

2 P.M.

Therefore, although it is broadly true that the housing problem is acute even in rural areas and that large masses of people in the rural areas have no kind of housing and it is desirable to provide them with the means or with residences, still, it seems to me that this Housing Board will only be dissipating its energies and spending its time in inconclusive explorations and directionless endeavours holding, probably, a roving investigation into the various difficulties that might exist

in different parts of the State without being able to undertake any concrete scheme of housing for the houseless. After all, the main purpose of this Bill appears to me to be this : that since the Government of India will be giving grants or donations or loans or subventions for providing housing to different sections of houseless people, these grants and loans and subventions will not be forthcoming unless we are able to show that there is a body set up by statute which will receive these moneys, put them in its funds and expend them in the manner prescribed by the statute. It seems to me that that is the main purpose of setting up the Housing Board. To that extent this Board will be, what may be called, a mop. It will mop up the financial assistance that might be provided by the Central Government or by the State Government, or by other bodies or individuals whether incorporated or not, as put down in clause 55 of the Bill.

Sir, it is certainly desirable that the Board should be set up to receive the grants and loans which will be coming from the Central Government and much more desirable that these moneys should be usefully expended on housing schemes for those who most need it. But the general scheme of this Bill requires to be drastically amended and amended in very many particulars before Government can enable this Board to function to any purpose whatever. I am sure my friend the Hon'ble Member Sri Venkatesh would agree with me that the setting up of the Housing Board would be a setback to some extent at least in regard to the providing of housing accommodation for industrial labour. When he spoke on the Bill, he did make reference to the various provisions which need to be amended in order to prevent this deterioration in the progress that has already been made and to see that at least the *status quo ante* is maintained in regard to what has been done for housing industrial labour in particular.

I should like to make reference to one or two more provisions which appear to me to require serious consideration at the hands of the

Government and the Select Committee. Sir, the omission of various provisions contained in the First Schedule to this Bill from the Mysore Labour Housing Act would leave that Act in such a truncated form that it would remain a kind of a shapeless, purposeless enactment on the Statute Book. Therefore, I suggest that the Government and the Select Committee might also address themselves to the task of incorporating whatever will be left of this Labour Housing Act after all these deletions have been made as set forth in the First Schedule of this Bill into the main body of the Housing Board Act itself. That, I think, would be a more satisfactory way of enacting a statute designed to provide housing not for any particular section of the population but for every section of the population, wherever the need is felt and the scheme can be undertaken and the resources permit. Therefore, Sir, I would seriously suggest, earnestly suggest to the Government that they might incorporate whatever is left of the Labour Housing Act, after amending it in the manner Government desires, into the main body of this Housing Board Act.

Then, my friend Sri D. Venkatesh made a reference to section 3 of the Mysore Labour Housing Act and to the proviso to that section. One of the amendments contained in the First Schedule to the Housing Board Bill is that in section 3 of the Labour Housing Act, after the proviso, another proviso shall be added. The existing section reads like this :

“There shall be levied and collected from every employer a contribution at a rate not exceeding four per cent on the monthly wage bill of the concern in respect of every employee whose income does not exceed on an average Rs. 125 a month who is not provided by such employer with housing accommodation of such standard as may be prescribed by the Government :

“Provided, however, it shall be open for any employer to pay this contribution or any part thereof

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

either in a lumpsum payment equivalent to one-third the cost of the house or in agreed instalments."

The amendment to this section that is proposed is to add another proviso, namely,

" Provided also that the contribution shall not be payable by an employer for any year, if with the approval of the Board and subject to such other conditions as may be prescribed, such employer constructs houses for his employees costing an amount equal to the contribution payable by him during that year."

During the course of the debate, when a suggestion was made by some Hon'ble Member who was speaking on the Bill that this contribution is not being paid by many employers and that Government have not compelled the payment of this contribution to the Labour Housing Corporation by the various employers, the Hon'ble the Law Minister said in reply that in pursuance of advice received or direction given by the Government of India, the levy of contribution has been suspended for the time being. I cannot claim to have any comparable acquaintance with schemes of labour housing like the Hon'ble Member Sri D. Venkatesh or my esteemed friend the Hon'ble the Law Minister. But my information is that this contribution has been very inconsiderable and has not, in fact, been paid by many employers. Whatever may be the reason for the suspension of the levy of the contribution, if this provision in the proposed statute makes it permissible for an employer to pay contribution either in a lumpsum equivalent to one-third the cost of the house or in agreed instalments and further provides that the contribution shall not be payable by an employer for any year if, with the approval of the Board and subject to such other conditions as may be prescribed, such employer constructs houses for his employees costing an amount equal to the contribution payable by him during

that year, then, to that extent the Housing Board would be stultifying itself and would be disabling itself from fulfilling the purpose for which it is set up. If the idea is to leave it to the employer to provide housing at a cost equivalent to the contribution that was leviable from him and the Housing Board is to be absolved of its specific responsibilities to undertake housing for those for whose benefit that contribution was to have been levied, to that extent this statute seems to provide for the abdication of the Board's function in favour of the employer whose good intentions for providing housing to his employees have been up to now a matter merely of legend not translated into what might be called, if not adequate at least reasonable, performance. Therefore, Sir, I would request my friend the Hon'ble the Law Minister to give more careful consideration to section 3 of the Mysore Labour Housing Act against the general background of the Housing Board Bill.

Then, Sir, clause 9 of this Bill which deals with the term of office and conditions of service of the members of the Board has been drafted in more than the usual cavalier manner.

" (1) Every member shall hold office for a period of three years from the date of his appointment :

Provided that after the expiry of the period of his appointment a person shall be eligible for re-appointment as a member.

(2) Every member shall receive such allowances as may be prescribed.

(3) The Chairman may hold office in an honorary capacity or on payment of remuneration. If any remuneration is to be paid to the Chairman, such remuneration and other conditions of service shall be such as may be prescribed."

There is, if I may say so without any disparagement and without seeking to cast any reflection upon anybody, a more than usual measure of the cavalier attitude in drafting the clause. I should say, and I am sure my friend the Law Minister will agree with me,

that Government must be able to make up its mind whether to have for such an important body as the Housing Board which will be entrusted with the task of providing houses to all the houseless people in the State, a Chairman who may hold office in an honorary capacity. However desirable it may be for the person who may choose to hold that office in an honorary capacity, I would say, for God's sake (I don't believe in God but I am sure Government does), for God's sake do not have an Honorary Chairman for a Board of this kind. Have the most competent engineer you can find in the country, pay him whatever he will ask, appoint him for a stated number of years, get the best out of him, and build as many houses as you can, provide houses for all those who have no houses or shelter of any kind; but do not provide yourself with this particular alternative of having a Chairman who may hold office in an honorary capacity. This Board will be in charge of a task which will involve expenditure of huge sums of money and Government owe it to themselves and to the country, and more especially to the Housing Board itself, to provide it with a Chairman of whom it ought not to be said that he can be there without being paid for it. Therefore I would suggest that sub-clause 3 of clause 9 should provide that the Chairman shall be paid such salary as may be prescribed. It is much better if you prescribe it in the clause itself so that the House may know what it is. And we may also know what kind of engineer or what kind of Chairman we can get for the salary we are prepared to pay. It would be extremely undesirable and unsatisfactory to have this second sentence in sub-clause (3): "If any remuneration is to be paid to the Chairman, such remuneration and other conditions of service shall be such as may be prescribed." Conditions of service must be prescribed whether there be any remuneration or not; and since I have been saying that there must be remuneration and handsome remuneration and that the Chairman must be a competent person, we shall also have the conditions on which his services will be

availed of by Government or the Housing Board laid down and prescribed in sufficient detail.

In sub-clause (4) of clause 14 of the Bill it is provided—

"Every appointment to posts carrying a maximum monthly salary exceeding rupees two hundred shall be made in consultation with the Mysore Public Service Commission :

Provided that this sub-section shall not apply to an officiating or temporary appointment for an aggregate period not exceeding one year. . . ."

The proviso would enable the Housing Board to by-pass the Public Service Commission, if it chooses, systematically by making appointments for an aggregate period not exceeding one year, in each case and on each of the several occasions. The next proviso says—

"Provided also that no appointment shall be made contrary to the advice of the Commission except with the approval of the State Government."

This, I must say, is not fair to the Public Service Commission. After all, although the Public Service Commission has been set up consisting of persons whose names have been proposed by the Government itself, still the Public Service Commission is an institution and has a constitutional existence. The setting up of the Public Service Commission is a requirement of the Constitution. The Public Service Commission is statutorily charged with certain functions and duties. And though there may be some justification, though there may be some necessity, I would say even if there should be no justification if there should be some necessity, when owing to administrative exigencies Government may be compelled to by-pass the Public Service Commission in the matter of a particular appointment or in the matter of dealing with an appointment in the public service otherwise than in the manner advised or suggested or proposed by the Public Service Commission, there

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

ought not to be a statutory provision enabling the Government to approve of another statutory body seeking to do the same kind of thing. The net effect of this second proviso to sub-clause 14 will be that if the Housing Board desires to make an appointment contrary to the expression used, *i.e.*, contrary to the advice of the Commission, all that is necessary would be for the Housing Board to persuade the Government to give its approval. Sir, it would not at all be desirable even for Government to give themselves with this power of approving the appointment of a person or an officer of the Board contrary to the advice of the Public Service Commission. If Government have any ground for considering that the Public Service Commission proposals do not meet the view-point of the Government in any particular manner or that the policy pursued by the Public Service Commission in regard to the making of appointments generally or the making of appointments in particular to the Housing Board are not in conformity with what the Government may consider to be desirable, then, it is for the Government to bring a legislative measure before this House as indicated in the Constitution to provide for the manner in which appointments to the public services in the State shall be made. The Constitution provides for the enactment of law which will prescribe how appointments to the public services of the State shall be made by the Public Service Commission. It is true that the Public Service Commission has been set up as required by the Constitution and that rules and regulations prescribing the manner in which appointments ought to be made by the Commission have been made which in substance are the same as those which existed even before the Public Service Commission itself came into existence. Though the rules and regulations have been saved by appropriate provision in the Constitution it does not, I must say, absolve the Government of their duty nor does it take away their right to bring in appropriate, well-considered and

elaborate legislation prescribing how appointments to the public services in the State shall hereafter have to be made. That would ensure that the collaboration of the Public Service Commission in the policy requirements from the Government point of view would be secured. That is, if I may say so, the proper way of dealing with the question of appointments not merely with respect to the Housing Board but generally.

2-30 P.M.

Therefore, Sir, I suggest that the Select Committee should seriously examine sub-clause (4) of clause 14 and amend it suitably.

Then clause 16 which deals with the appointment of committees is again somewhat vaguely worded. It says :

“Subject to any rules made under section 67 the Board may, from time to time, appoint one or more Committees for the purpose of securing that the functions of the Board are exercised with due regard to the circumstances and requirements of particular local areas.”

The scheme of the Bill does not make any particular provision as to how these committees should discharge the functions which may be entrusted to them. Clause 18 which relates to the procedure of such committees lays down that any committee appointed under section 16 shall meet to discharge the functions assigned to it in such manner as may be directed by the Board. Sir, it is not clear whether the intention of the Government is that the Board is enabled under clauses 16 and 18 to constitute Committees for special purposes from among the members of the Housing Board itself or whether the intention is to invest this Housing Board with powers of patronage in the matter of constituting these Committees under clause 16 for the nebulous purpose of securing that the functions of the Board are exercised with due regard to the circumstances and requirements of particular local areas. If Government are alive, as clause 16 establishes that they are

alive, to the fact that the requirements of particular local areas, the requirements of different regions, the requirements of different parts of the State, urban or rural, are bound to be different and vary from place to place and from industry to industry and from one urban area to another, it is the more surprising that Government should seek to have a Housing Board which will swallow up the existing Labour Housing Corporation just for the fun of being able to set up regional committees, the composition of which is left to be prescribed by rules to be framed on principles which are not discoverable in any part of this Bill. I wish to assert that I have read this Bill as carefully as it is my duty to do and as the Bill itself deserves. But I must say that there is no indication of the manner in which these Committees are to be set up or of the powers which they are to exercise or of the manner in which they shall deputise or act as agents of the Board. Clause 18, as I said already, merely provides for the procedure to be followed by these Committees. "Any Committee appointed under section 16 shall meet to discharge the function assigned to it in such manner as may be directed by the Board." These Committees, then, will have no initiative even with regard to the local requirements or to those circumstances and requirements of particular local areas to which a reference is made in clause 16, but will merely be a number of persons who are required under clause 18 to meet to discharge the functions assigned to them in such manner as may be directed by the Board. I ask, why should a Committee be necessary if the function that may be assigned to such a Committee is to be discharged in the manner directed by the Board? A Committee would be wholly unnecessary. To my mind, it seems that an executive agency would be much more appropriate and would be the most suitable agency for discharging the functions assigned to that agency by the Board. The more so because these functions have to be discharged in conformity with the directions given

by the Board. This Board, Sir, is a statutory body. Its existence itself under law is determined and circumscribed by the various limitations which the statute will impose upon it. To invest such a statutory authority with powers to set up committees charged with no specific functions and governed by no recognised principles either in regard to their constitution or in respect of their functions, is merely to make provision for the exercise of patronage by the Housing Board. I am quite certain, and I am not saying it as an argument, I am quite certain that it is not the intention of the Government to invest the Housing Board with power to constitute committees merely to enable it to exercise patronage. That cannot be the object of this legislation. They have some vague notion that this Housing Board will not be able to undertake all the work that may be found necessary all over the State in respect of housing schemes and therefore subsidiary agencies are necessary. This is a most obvious fact. Housing—as I have said at the very outset of my speech—is a task that can be performed best by decentralised agencies. A House Building Co-operative Society can build houses for the members of that society much better than any other agency with wider concept and poor foundations. An Industrial Housing Corporation can undertake housing schemes for industrial labour much better, infinitely better than a Housing Board saddled with the responsibility for providing—I do not know how many—lakhs of houses for the lakhs and lakhs of houseless people in the State. Therefore, while the need for devising decentralised agencies for distributive functioning and effective functioning is so obvious, I am surprised that Government have not made any suitable provision for providing these decentralised agencies.

Sir, I am not quite familiar with the co-operative field and so Hon'ble Members who may be better informed will show some indulgence towards me if I am inaccurate in using expressions for certain institutions. There is a Central Provincial House Building Corporation

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

whose business it is to provide monetary assistance and financial resources to various House Building Co-operative Societies throughout the State which undertake housing schemes or for the purpose of lending money to those who happen to be members of these house-building co-operative societies and to see that houses are built; and at the same time it is the policy and function of this Provincial House Building Corporation to build houses as I am informed and to undertake housing schemes of its own accord in a limited field. Now I ask

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Any-where in the State. In fact it has undertaken to build houses in Davanagere, Mysore, Bangalore and has constructed several houses also.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—This Corporation, I do not even know the name of it and so I will not be suspected of holding a brief for any set of institutions or any set of persons managing these institutions, this Corporation performs useful work if it is allowed to function and if its operations are not superseded by the creation of a Housing Board which will have a kind of monopolistic responsibility for undertaking housing schemes of all kinds. The Hon'ble the Law Minister is aware that an institution like the Mysore Bank has recently executed a housing scheme and has built houses for its own employees within the Bangalore Corporation area and to that extent it has met a particular local requirement. If my Hon'ble friend and Law Minister has had occasion to see those houses and to know how the Mysore Bank has enabled itself to build those houses for its employees, he will be in a position to appreciate that housing schemes are best undertaken on a limited scale, for specified purposes and to meet local requirements of particular kinds. A kind of a general invitation to the whole world to come and obtain assistance from this Housing Board and get houses will not result in anything that would be tangible or in anything that Government or the Board would be in a position to congratulate itself upon.

Then, Sir, clause 23 of this Bill which deals with the duty of the Board to undertake housing schemes has to be read with clause 36 which lays down the other duties of the Board. Clause 23 says—

“Subject to the provisions of this Act and subject to the control of the State Government, the Board may incur expenditure and undertake works in any area to which this Chapter applies for the framing and execution of such housing schemes as it may consider necessary from time to time, or as may be entrusted to it by the State Government.”

That, in general, is the main duty of the Board. Now clause 36 lays down the other duties of the Board.—

“It shall be the duty of the Board to take measures with a view to expediting and cheapening construction of buildings and the Board may for that purpose do all things for—

- (a) unification, simplification and standardisation of building materials;
- (b) encouraging prefabrication and mass production of house components;
- (c) organising or undertaking the production of building materials required for the housing schemes;
- (d) encouraging research for discovering cheap building materials and evolving new methods of economic construction;
- (e) securing a steady and sufficient supply of workmen trained in the work of construction of buildings.”

I have no desire to be unduly critical either of the proposals of the Government or of the provisions of the Bill, but sub-clause (b) of clause 36 revives most disagreeable memories. This country, Sir, has had certain unfortunate experiences at the hands of unscrupulous persons who happened to get Government employment under various

pretexts, not to use any stronger expression, in Delhi. The Government of India established a housing factory where prefabricated housing material was to have been manufactured and put it in charge of certain engineers in whose skill the Government put much trust. The factory purported to work for two or three years to produce prefabricated housing materials, but it produced nothing but scandal and scandal involving lakhs and lakhs of rupees of the poor tax-payers' money. In this country people, at least in rural areas, are satisfied with very modest provision for their houses. They are not asking for cement concrete housing, they are not asking even for Mangalore tile roofed buildings. If a houseless person in a rural area can be enabled by some manner of assistance to build for himself a mud house provided with a thatched roof he will be grateful to the country, he will be grateful to the society and he will be grateful to the Government. We are not able to provide adequate funds to enable ten per cent, not of the entire houseless population in the rural areas, but ten per cent or even five per cent of the houseless Scheduled Castes population in the rural areas to build themselves houses. I do not know if the Hon'ble Minister in charge of this Bill has any administrative responsibility for providing assistance either in money or in material to poor persons of the Scheduled Castes for building houses. Ready-made windows, doors and roofing materials sometimes are provided in order to enable them to construct a house and put a roof over it and call it a house. Sir, I shall digress for just half a minute to use a particular expression in Kannada which will describe not only accurately but also honestly the kind of material that is actually supplied by the Government agency.

ಅಂದ ಮರದ ಕಿಟಕಿ ಅರೆಬೇಯಲು ಹೆಂಚು ಮುಂತಾ ದುವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನೂರುಸಾರಿ ಸ್ವಪ್ನ ಅಫೀಸರ ಬಳಿ ಅಥವಾ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಅಫೀಸರ ಬಳಿ ತಿರುಗಬೇಕು. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಹರಿಜನರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸುವ ಜನರೂ ಸಹ ಬರಬೇಕು, ಬಹಳ ಹೊತ್ತು ಕಾಯಬೇಕು. ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಹರಿಜನರನ್ನು ಕರೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವವರು ಅವರನ್ನು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ

ಅಫೀಸರ ಬಳಿ ಹೋಗಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಸಹಾಯ ನೀಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅದರ ನೆಟ್ ರಿಸಲ್ಟ್ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದರೆ ಹೆಂಚು, ಕಿಟಕಿ ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೊಡುವ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಮಣ್ಣಿನ ಗೋಡೆ ಯೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಳೆಗೆ ಕರಗಿಹೋಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಮರಬೇಕು, ಬೊಂಬುಬೇಕು; ಕಾಡಿನಿಂದ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಫಾರಿಸ್ಟ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ವ್ಯವಹಾರಿಕ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ನಿಧಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಬರಲು ಕಾಲವಿಳಂಬವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಬೇಗ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Why I refer to this particular matter is to emphasise the limitations under which any Government agency must necessarily function. An administrative machinery set up for the exclusive purpose of providing building material to houseless Scheduled Castes people who apply for such assistance cannot function, I will not say efficiently, cannot function effectively. There are severe limitations upon the proper functioning of any such agency and the most important of those limitations is the large number of persons, entitled to that assistance, who come with applications seeking grant of such assistance before Government or the Governmental agencies. Whenever any Hon'ble Minister goes on a tour, it is within the experience of the Hon'ble Minister and every Hon'ble Member who has had the opportunity of accompanying any Hon'ble Minister that 50 per cent of the hundreds of petitions that are presented to and are received by the Hon'ble Minister come from these Scheduled Castes people and

Mr. CHAIRMAN (SRI K. PRABHAKAR).—What is the suggestion?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I shall try to complete the sentence and then proceed to suggest. 50 per cent of these numerous petitions relate to the grant of monetary or material assistance for enabling them to build houses or ask for the provision of drinking water facilities for Scheduled Castes people or for the provision of sites upon which to build houses. I do not think there is any doubt in anybody's mind as to the genuineness of these demands or the largeness of the problem itself. If Government had not been able to make satisfactory provision to meet these

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

demands to some reasonable extent, it is undoubtedly because the financial resources of the Government are not only limited but are seriously crippled after the financial integration that took place some years ago. The sources of revenue left to the State are inelastic and the assistance that can be given by the Central Government is bound to be limited and to be conditioned with a stipulation that an equivalent amount at least must be expended by the Exchequer of the State itself. Therefore, with these severe limitations and with this stupendous task of providing houses for lakhs and lakhs of houseless families in the State, Government must realise that the setting up of this Board will be the beginning of a new headache, the type of which they have not known till now in an acute form.

3 P.M.

With the setting up of a Board with the avowed object of undertaking housing schemes for everybody in the State, the demands that are likely to be made upon such a housing board will be of a magnitude

Sri V. VENKATAPPA (Channapatna).—I think the Hon'ble Member may continue after lunch, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—May I know how long the Hon'ble Member will take to complete his speech?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Some time more. But I have no objection to continue after tea-time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—The House will now adjourn for lunch and meet at 3-30.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Three Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty-three Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. SPEAKER.—You had not finished, Sri Rama Rao?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I have just a little more to say. I was referring to clause 23 and clause 36 of the Bill which lay down the various duties of the Board. Clause 36 provides—

“It shall be the duty of the Board to take measures with a view to expediting and cheapening construction of buildings and the Board may for that purpose do all things for—

(a) unification, simplification and standardisation of building materials; * * *

It is somewhat difficult to understand what is really meant by “unification” of building materials or “simplification” of building materials. I can quite understand the desirability of providing for standardisation of building materials.

Then, with regard to encouraging prefabrication and mass production of house components, it may be necessary to undertake the manufacture on a large scale of building materials such as doorways, window frames, and burnt bricks and roofing tiles and many other such component materials necessary for the construction of houses. But if the Board expends its moneys on the establishment of factories for the manufacture of door frames and window frames or on the establishment of factories for the manufacture of flooring tiles and roofing tiles or factories for the increased production of burnt bricks, to that extent the result would be adversely reflected in reduced employment in those occupations in the local areas. If for instance in a place like Tumkur this Housing Board undertakes the manufacture of bricks or window frames or door frames, to that extent local initiative in the manufacture of these articles is either stifled or discouraged, because no private individual can compete in the production or manufacture of materials with a quasi-Governmental agency like the Housing Board. I would suggest that the Housing Board should confine itself to housing schemes without being deflected into launching upon enterprises like manufacture of raw materials necessary for building houses, in

the first instance at least. These materials are being manufactured at present and the supply position is really determined by the effective demand for such materials. If the Housing Board requires large quantities of bricks, tiles, wooden materials, structural iron, steel or cement, there are agencies which are producing these articles and the Housing Board will certainly be in a position to obtain whatever supplies it may want for implementing its own schemes without being compelled itself to undertake the manufacture or the production of these raw materials. Therefore I would suggest that clause 36 may be further examined with a view to eliminate subsidiary enterprises on the part of the Housing Board so that the Board may be enabled to function effectively and take up the actual task of constructing houses.

Then, Sir, I pass on to clause 40 and clause 41 and I will make only one observation here because many other Hon'ble Members have already spoken on these clauses. Sub-clause 3 of clause 40 says—

“Such betterment charges shall also be leviable in respect of any land not comprised in the scheme but adjacent to area comprised in the scheme.”

The imposition of betterment charges on adjoining areas not included in the scheme but the value of which may be incidentally and indirectly enhanced by any housing scheme undertaken by the Housing Board would not be reasonable. It cannot be said that a betterment charge can be properly levied on lands adjoining the urban area of the Bangalore Corporation because the value of the adjoining lands is enhanced or increased by the amenities provided from the schemes undertaken within the area of the Corporation of Bangalore. The imposition of this betterment charge on lands not comprised in the scheme would not be reasonable and clause 41 which deals with notice to persons liable for betterment charges should also be further examined along with sub-clause (3) of clause 40.

Then, in Chapter V dealing with tribunals, Hon'ble Members have suggested that the tribunal should not consist of only the District Judge having jurisdiction in the area concerned, but must consist of additional persons so that the total number of persons constituting the tribunal may be at least three. I consider that that suggestion is quite reasonable, more especially because I happen to know that the District Judges having jurisdiction in a certain area, even as things are, can hardly find the time to dispose of the matters which are already in their hands and unless the Government are in a position to establish and redistribute District Courts in a larger number, it would be very difficult for the District Judges' Courts to deal with the additional business which will come before them in the wake of this Housing Board Act after it is passed into law.

Then clause 49 refers to the decision of the tribunal being final. It is stated—

“The decision of the Tribunal on any matter referred to it under this Act shall be final and shall not be questioned in any court of law.”

Clause 47 provides that the tribunal shall decide whether any compensation is payable under section 32; decide the amount of compensation in matters referred to it under section 34; and decide disputes relating to betterment charges referred to it under section 41. Disputes relating to betterment charges may also relate to imposition of betterment charges on adjoining areas not included within the scheme. And tribunal shall also decide disputes relating to the reconstitution of plots referred to it under section 45 and the amount of compensation to be awarded in consequence thereof; and decide such other matters as may be prescribed by the rules made in this behalf. These matters are essentially matters of controversy; matters involving justiciable rights and therefore clause 49 would not be a reasonable provision. Nothing is lost by providing a reasonable remedy by way of appeal to an

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

appellate authority. The mere fact that the statute lays down that the decision of the tribunal on any matter referred to it under the Act shall be final and shall not be questioned in any court of law, would not prevent legal proceedings being instituted in a different form with which we are now sufficiently familiar. Wherever we do not provide a forthright legal remedy by way of appeal, reference or revision, the proceedings of the tribunal are sought to be quashed by a writ or direction from the High Court in the exercise of its extraordinary powers conferred by the Constitution. And therefore, instead of driving people to seek these extraordinary remedies and to have recourse to extraordinary procedure, nothing is lost by providing a reasonable, legitimate and ordinary remedy by way of appeal, reference or revision. And after all in the matter of compensation, although most questions are essentially questions of fact, occasionally a question of mixed law and fact or a question of law itself might arise in numerous instances and nothing is lost, as I said, by making a reasonable provision for reference or revision.

Then, Sir, in Chapter VI which deals with the power to evict persons from the Board premises, it will be seen from clause 50 and the succeeding clauses that certain executive action is authorised in favour of a very roughly designated authority described as 'competent authority'. The definition of the expression 'competent authority' is contained in clause 2 of the Bill—item No. (8): 'Competent authority' means any person authorised by the State Government, by notification in the *Mysore Gazette*, to perform the functions of the competent authority under Chapter VI for such area as may be specified in the notification. The definition does not give even a probable indication—even a general indication of the kind of officer who by notification in the *Gazette* may be designated as 'competent authority'. And the duties to be discharged and the functions to be performed by the 'competent authority' are quite analogous to

the duties to be discharged and the functions to be performed by the House Rent Controller under the House Rent and Accommodation Control Act which has been passed into law. The real effect of designating 'competent authority' under Chapter VI and entrusting it with the various powers and functions dealt with in the succeeding clauses will be to set up what may be called a parallel authority having parallel jurisdiction simultaneously with the rent control authorities. How far that would be desirable and what prevents the conferment upon the House Rent and Accommodation Control authorities of jurisdiction in respect of matters falling under Chapter VI of this Act, are matters on which I hope Government will make some further investigation.

In clause 50, it is provided in sub-clause (1) paragraph (b) that any person in unauthorised occupation of any Board premises may be dealt with in the manner laid down therein; and it is provided that—

“the competent authority may, notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force, by notice served (i) by post, or (ii) by affixing a copy of it on the outer door or some other conspicuous part of such premises, or (iii) in such other manner as may be prescribed, order that that person as well as any other person who may be in occupation of the whole or any part of the premises, shall vacate them within one month of the date of the service of the notice.”

All that I wish to say about the manner of service of notice is that in addition to the modes provided in (ii) and (iii), the service by post must at least be by registered post with acknowledgment due so that even if an unreasonable or intractable squatter on Board premises refuses service of the notice, there may be evidence of the service and the refusal of the notice such as is considered sufficient in general civil law. Service by ordinary post would not be quite a reasonable provision.

Then, Sir, in clause 53, it is provided that any person who is aggrieved by an order of the competent authority under section 50 or section 51, as the case may be, may prefer an appeal to the State Government. Sir, I should like the Government to examine the undesirability of setting up a parallel body for dealing with accommodation control or allotment of accommodation. If they find their way to entrust this work to the existing Accommodation Controller or allotment authority, the same remedy that is provided in that Act may be considered a reasonable provision by way of appeal even in respect of orders made by the competent authority designated under this Act, if the authority designated is the House Rent Controller himself.

Then, Sir, clause 54 expressly bars the jurisdiction of courts :

“ No order made by the State Government or the competent authority in the exercise of any power conferred by or under this Chapter shall be called in question in any court and no injunction shall be granted by any court or other authority in respect of any action taken or to be taken in pursuance of any power conferred by or under this Chapter.”

As I have already said with reference to an earlier clause, every attempt to shut out the ordinary exercise of jurisdiction by established courts of law merely results in driving aggrieved persons to seek extraordinary remedies which entail delay and unpleasantness to everybody concerned including the ‘competent authority’ or the Housing Board itself. And therefore, while certainly it is desirable to provide that no injunction shall be granted by any court, it is not desirable to say that no order made by the Government or competent authority in exercise of any powers conferred by or under any provisions of this Chapter shall be called in question in any Court. That provision would not be reasonable and it would not really prevent cognisance being taken or jurisdiction being exercised by the High Court because extraordinary remedies may be sought by

having recourse to extraordinary proceedings. And therefore, I would assert that nothing is to be gained and a great deal is to be lost by trying to bar the jurisdiction of ordinary courts.

Then, Sir, I pass on to clause 61 in Chapter VII which provides for concurrent and special audits and accounts. Sub-clause (1) of clause 61 provides that—

“ Notwithstanding anything contained in section 60, the State Government may order that there shall be concurrent audit of the accounts of the Board by such person as it thinks fit. The State Government may also direct a special audit to be made by such a person as it thinks fit of the accounts of the Board relating to any particular transaction or a class or series of transactions or to a particular period.”

Since this audit, whether general audit or concurrent or special audit, relates not to the administration as such but to the accounts of the Board, it would be desirable for Government at least to provide that a special audit be made by a Chartered Accountant. There have been—there has been at least one instance—though I am very reluctant to refer to the particular matter, where a special audit has been directed to be carried on by an officer who does not possess and who cannot claim to possess any qualification which may be regarded as adequate for performing the duties of an auditor or accountant.

4 P.M.

After all, the audit must be carried out on commercial lines. The Board's financial transactions must be carried on as if the Housing Board were a commercial body responsible for profit or loss and dealing with moneys, though provided by a generous or a benign Government, in a responsible way like a Corporation or a mercantile firm. Therefore, the concurrent or special audit, whenever Government orders or directs it, must be carried out by a Chartered Accountant and there is a very wide range of choice available for Government

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

in appointing an Auditor in the circumstances of any particular case.

Then, Sir, in Chapter VIII, I wish to say something with respect to clause 67 which deals with the power to make rules. I would suggest that in view of the great importance of the matters dealt with by the Housing Board, the rules which the State Government will frame in exercise of the power conferred on Government by clause 67 of this Bill, should be laid on the Table of both Houses so that the rules may be finalised after being amended or modified in such manner as both the Houses of Legislature may consider it desirable to amend or modify them.

Then, Sir, clauses 73 and 75. Clause 73 makes it necessary for any complaint being entertained by the Court, that such complaint should be authorised by the Board by general or specific provision. That, I think, is quite desirable. But clause 75 which says that no suit, prosecution or other legal proceeding shall lie against any person for anything which is in good faith done or purported to be done under this Act, will give really no protection because it is always open to an aggrieved person or a person considering himself to be aggrieved by any act of the Housing Board or any Agency set up by the Housing Board, to question the legality of the proceedings or the legality of the orders instituted or made against him by recourse to extraordinary procedure. It is true that such a general provision is usually made in some legislative enactments. They used to make it before the Constitution came into force and we have not given up the habit of continuing to have such provisions. But what, I ask, is the real effect or the real protection actually given to any officer or any person for anything done by him or purported to have been done by him under this Act, if the act done by him can be questioned by means of appropriate proceedings? The jurisdiction of the Courts cannot be shut out or ousted by having a provision of this kind in an enactment.

There is one last matter, Sir, with which I shall conclude my speech.

Item 11 of the First Schedule to the Bill provides that in sub-section (4) of section 27 of the Labour Housing Act, for the words commencing from "not exceeding" to the end of the sub-section, the words, brackets and figures, "taking into consideration, (i) the cost of construction of the accommodation, and (ii) the cost of maintenance of the accommodation," shall be substituted. Section 27 of the Labour Housing Act provides in sub-clause (4) that there shall be payable in respect of the occupation of any such accommodation as aforesaid, rent at such rate as may be prescribed not exceeding:

(i) where a single employee occupies such accommodation, seven and a half per cent of the capital cost of the accommodation or ten per cent of the wages of such employee, whichever is less; and

(ii) where more than one employee occupy such accommodation, ten per cent of the capital cost of the accommodation or fifteen per cent of the wages of the highest paid employee among them, whichever is less."

The proposed amendment in item 11 of the First Schedule to this Bill seeks to delete these two paragraphs contained in sub-section (4) of section 27 of the Act and provide in substitution the following:

"There shall be payable in respect of the occupation of any such accommodation as aforesaid rent at such rate as may be prescribed taking into consideration the cost of construction of the accommodation and the cost of maintenance of the accommodation."

This does make a very real difference to the rent that may have to be paid by employees for the kind of accommodation which the Labour Housing Corporation is now providing for them. The effect of the deletion of this provision in the Labour Housing Act and the substitution of the proposed amendment will be to cause a general

increase in the rent payable by wage earners not merely for the accommodation which the Housing Board may hereafter provide for wage-earners in the manner envisaged in the Bill, but also in respect of the accommodation already provided by the Labour Housing Corporation and to increase and enhance the rents now payable for such premises already occupied by wage-earners. And the reasonable limitations such as that the rent should not exceed $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the capital cost of the accommodation or 10 per cent of the wages of such employee, or 10 per cent of the capital cost of the accommodation or 15 per cent of the wages of the higher paid employee, whichever is less, in the case of a single wage-earner and in the case of more than one wage-earner will be removed. Wage-earners entitled to the benefits already enjoyed by them under the existing Mysore Labour Housing Act will be deprived of those benefits and would be liable in common to pay increased rent. That would not be ameliorative so far as urban areas are concerned. Therefore, Sir, I suggest that item 11 of this First Schedule may also be further examined with a view to see whether the existing limitations cannot be retained in sub-section (4) of section 27 of the Mysore Labour Housing Act.

The last thing, Sir, to which I now refer is the Second Schedule to the Bill. Under clause 79 of the Bill it is provided that the enactments mentioned in the third column of the Second Schedule to this Act are hereby amended to the extent and in the manner mentioned in the fourth column hereof. The City of Mysore Improvement Act is to be amended by the insertion of a new section 14-A in that Act to the effect that notwithstanding anything contained in that Act, no improvement scheme shall be made for any area for which a housing scheme has been sanctioned under the Mysore Housing Board Act, 1954. And similarly, in the case of the City of Bangalore Improvement Act, 1945, a new section 14-A is to be inserted in that Act to provide that notwithstanding anything contained in that

Act, no improvement scheme providing for matters specified in clauses (f), (g), (l) and (m) of Section 24 of the Mysore Housing Board Act, 1954, shall be made by the Board for any area for which a housing scheme has been sanctioned under the Mysore Housing Board Act, 1954. And further, "where any improvement scheme is made under this Act for any area after providing for the matters specified in clauses (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (h), (i), (j), (k), (n), (o) and (p) of section 24 of the Mysore Housing Board Act, 1954, the area shall be handed over to the Housing Board for providing for the matters specified in clauses (f), (g), (l) and (m) of section 24 of the said Act." But, the mere insertion of these two new sections into these two enactments will not enable the Housing Board to function more effectively nor can these provisions eliminate the inevitable friction between the Housing Board on the one hand and the two bodies that have been set up for the improvement of the City of Mysore and the City of Bangalore on the other. Unless Government envisage the eventual supersession or the abolition of these special bodies which have been set up for the improvement of these two cities and the inclusion of the functions of these bodies within the scope of the Housing Board Act, there will be a multiplicity of agencies and also a multiplicity of jurisdiction and therefore a necessary development of continuous friction which, so far as the administration of the Housing Board after it is constituted is concerned, will make not for progress but for delay, vexation and administrative embarrassment at all levels including the governmental level. With these observations I expect that the Hon'ble the Law Minister will have all these various points very carefully examined by the Select Committee to which he proposes the Bill should be referred.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think the discussion will continue tomorrow also at this rate.

Sri B. T. KEMPA RAJ (Bangalore South—Scheduled Castes).—The Government has placed this Bill before this House. Many of the Hon'ble Members

(SRI B. T. KEMPA RAJ.)

have given their valuable suggestions. The Bill is of very great importance. It has made every member to think, if such a Board comes into existence, how it will work, where it will work, whether it will work successfully or otherwise. But I do not say so much as some Hon'ble Members have said, including Sri K. Pattabhiraman. It is high time for us to consider providing housing accommodation which the country is in need of. When the two necessities, namely, food and clothing, have been supplied, it is necessary to think of providing dwelling accommodation. Now, the Government has made up its mind to introduce this Housing Board Bill for consideration. Of course, Sir, it gives a very broad scope to think, when there are so many agencies to work or to attend to the construction of houses in the State, why there should be such a machinery as the Mysore Housing Board. It is also necessary for us to find out whether there is any necessity to have such a Board at this juncture. We know that the Central Government has introduced the Five-Year Plan to be worked out. As our friend Sri M. V. Rama Rao has already said, the Central Government will be giving some financial aid to meet the necessities of houses for the poorer and the middle class people. When the Central Government has got a scheme like that, is it not advisable to have an agency in conformity with the conditions and regulations that will be laid down by the Central Government? When such is the necessity, it is quite essential to have a Board of this type. It is also suggested by some of our friends that there are several societies, house building corporations, who have been doing the kind of work that is contemplated by the Board. When these societies and corporations have been trying their utmost to give their financial aid to a limited extent to build houses in big cities, the whole question is how to solve the dire necessity of providing dwelling accommodation in rural parts. We have been finding out the means to solve a very important problem, namely, the housing problem in rural areas. From

that point of view, if we consider the Bill, we can say that the working of this Board will be useful to the greatest extent possible in rural parts. Take any village, for example. There will be demands for sites, for village extensions, for Harijan colony. Throughout the State, in almost every village, we can see that there is demand for more and more sites and housing accommodation. Therefore it is high time that a Bill of this kind is brought into force in order to meet the demands of the rural parts.

As far as the constitution of this Board is concerned, the Board will have a Chairman and other members nominated by the Government. If the Chairman and the members are to be nominated, preference should be given to technical persons, those who are experienced in that field. We have seen for the last few years how the Trust Board is working in Bangalore. If we get a real picture of the working of this Trust Board, it is no wonder if I say that this Housing Board, which is meant to satisfy the dire necessity and the need for housing accommodation throughout the State should be thought of. The Trust Board started with the good intention of providing accommodation for persons in the city. Extensions have been formed; but sites are lying vacant; and the money spent for the formation of these sites have not been realised. Nor there is a hope that there will be demand for these sites at least in the coming year. The fate of the working of this Housing Board should not be of that nature. Government should see how best this Board should work for the purpose for which it is proposed to be started and for the purpose for which it is meant.

Again, there will be great competition between the local bodies and this Board. What work is anticipated to be undertaken by this Board is also done by the local bodies like village panchayets, municipalities and district boards. There should not be conflict between these local bodies and this Board as far as possible. In regard to the working of these separate bodies is concerned, rules should be framed to see that the work of one body does not overlap on

the other. Because there is every probability that the work of this Board may overlap on the work of these local bodies. To give an instance, a place which the Bangalore City Corporation intends to acquire the Board may also propose to acquire. There may be a controversy between the two as regards acquisition proceedings are concerned. As such this may result in a lot of hardship. So before constituting this Board, it is necessary to frame a set of rules as to the proper working of this Board.

As regards acquisition proceedings, it is stated in the Bill that the Board may authorise any individual to enter any part of a property at any time by giving a day's notice, provided such entry shall be made after sunrise and before sunset. This is a very difficult problem to solve. Sufficient time must be given, at least a week's time, to such person whose properties are proposed to be acquired or taken over to the jurisdiction of the Board.

4-30 P.M.

Sir, as far as the procedure of taking over the properties and lands is concerned, the Board should make it a point to give sufficient time to such individuals whose properties will be requisitioned for the purpose of the working of this Board. Thereby, I think, Sir, that sufficient time should be given to the people who will be affected by the working of this Board.

Coming to the remedies that will be given to the persons affected by the working of this Board, Sir, any individual whose properties or lands will be taken over by the Board for specific purposes would be given all possible remedies to get adequate compensation in a court of law, and as our friend Sri Rama Rao has already said, the scope for going in appeal to the courts of law should not be restricted because it is necessary to give guarantee to the person that is affected to seek redress in any manner that is allowed under the Constitution. Fixing the jurisdiction at the Government level will not be adequate justice to the person that is affected.

Sir, another point I want to say is about the decision of cases. The tribunal should not consist of a single individual. It should have a body of persons wherein all the possible remedies will be given to the person that is affected. Therefore, Sir, there should be all the possibilities for the person to seek redress in almost all the ways to get a proper award.

Sir, as far as the working of the Board is concerned, the Board should not make it a point to make schemes involving great financial expenditure. These schemes should be such as they must be within the reach of the poor man who is badly in need of housing accommodation. Sir, I put it to you, if the value of the sites goes to the extent of Rs. 1,500 or Rs. 2,000, it will be a great problem for the poor man to think of buying at least a site. That is the reason why so many sites are still lying vacant, undemanded and unrequired by so many persons who are very poor. These sites that have been formed by the Trust Board are very costly. Suppose the market value of these sites is high, it will be very hard for the poor man to think of buying a site even. Therefore, Sir, if at all the Government is thinking of helping the poor who are necessarily in need of the sites, the Government should think before they constitute this Board whether they will be able to provide sites or to provide houses to the poor people in the State. If the same state of affairs which is prevailing in Bangalore Trust Board to-day continues to prevail even under the contemplated Board, it is not advisable—at least I personally feel that it is not advisable—to have a Board which may require enormous sums. Therefore, Sir, as far as my knowledge goes, I am suggesting that if the Government through the agency of this Board is able to provide sites to the poor people at least within a value of Rs. 300 in or surrounding Bangalore City, it will be possible for more people who are poor to have chances of getting sites. Sir, I can give a specific instance. It is a well-known fact, as some of our friends have already expressed, that there are slum areas in Bangalore City and round

(SRI B. T. KEMPA RAJ.)

about. If this Board is going to give proper accommodation to those who are living in these slum areas, if the Board chalks out a scheme whereby the sites may cost above Rs. 300, the people residing in these slum areas will not be able to buy these sites. If that be the case, I ask, what is the good of bringing into existence or setting up such a Board which will not bring satisfaction to the citizens of the State? Therefore, Sir, it is high time even for the Government to think of this aspect, before having such a Board functioning, whether it will be possible to provide sites to these poor persons who are residing in slums and who cannot afford to buy costly sites.

Sir, another point which I would like to point out is, if this Board is able to provide sites, it will not be advisable to provide such sites somewhere 7 or 8 or 9 miles outside the Corporation area and ask the poor people residing in these slum areas to go and settle there. It will not be right to ask these poor people to go and settle outside the city area where they cannot get any cooly or labour. Let us not think of such a scheme being undertaken by this Board which will not work out favourably to the poor class, in providing housing accommodation. To cite an instance, Sir, the Corporation has removed about 250 sheds near Kalasipalyam which existed there for the last six or seven years and proper place is not provided for the displaced, within the city limits. To quote another instance, Sir, Government have acquired a block of houses by the side of the Town Hall, which existed there since 1914, without providing them with an alternative accommodation. Those people are the natives of the City, the so-called Model City of Bangalore. They have been asked to clear out from there and the place which is proposed to be allotted for these people has now been sold by public auction for thousands of rupees. If that state of affairs would result by the setting up of the Board which is under contemplation, it is rather doubtful if lower and middle class people would at all be benefited by such a Board.

Sir, the City Improvement Trust Board has constructed some houses in Jayanagar Extension and also in Rajajinagar Extension. If any of the Hon'ble Members of this House see those houses, it will give them a true picture as to whether this Board may work successfully or otherwise. I quote these instances just to bring it home to Government to think twice before formulating such a Board.

Sir, in the Bill it is stated that the Board could have sub-committees. I agree that it is essential to give powers to these sub-committees which should consist of persons of the local area. As regards funds to this Board, Sir, I may suggest it is advisable for Government to make a provision in this Bill to invite shares from such of the societies and corporations which have been undertaking building schemes for the several years past. It gives a guarantee to the members of such societies that sufficient encouragement and support could be got from the Board. Therefore such societies may be asked to invest their funds in this Board and a provision be made in the Bill for that.

Then Sir, a word about solving the housing problem of the Harijans. It is true, Sir, that Government have been evincing keen interest in this matter but in my opinion there is no specified scheme so far as this question is concerned. The Board should have a definite scheme for this particular work. According to the Five-Year Plan, I learn, a sum of one crore of rupees is estimated to be spent for the amelioration of Depressed Classes. The scheme of solving the problem of housing Harijans may be included in this. When the question of solving the accommodation problem of Harijans comes up, the question of untouchability also comes up. It is mainly because of the prevalence of untouchability all the hardship is caused and experienced by these people in getting proper accommodation. I do not entirely agree that untouchability is the only cause. So many forces there will be which make these persons not able to have proper accommodation. Therefore the Board should think of having a scheme to solve this problem somehow

or other. Especially in Bangalore City where there will be so many unauthorised constructions by Harijan coolies, who are actually working as coolies here and there and who cannot go away from the city because of the difficulties of not getting any work to eke out their livelihood, the Board should think of providing for them a suitable place somewhere inside the city and have the houses built.

I may state this much that this Board may work successfully if it takes into consideration that the poor and the lower income groups are provided with houses. If that is the intention, if that is the desire, if that is the scheme of this Board, I think it will solve the problem. And it has been suggested that there is no limitation to the period of duration for the working of the Board specified in this Bill. The housing problem will be a developing problem. There may not be any end to this problem, because the State is becoming more or less a Welfare State. When the question of Welfare State comes into the minds of the people, it is also the duty of the Government, of any Government, to think of undertaking such schemes. Therefore it is not necessary in my opinion to have a period of duration for the working of this Board. When this Board comes into existence, bodies like the City Improvement Trust Board may be put an end to by entrusting the work of these Boards to the Housing Board. With these suggestions I conclude my observations.

5 P.M.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ (ಪೆರಿಯಾಪಟ್ಟಣ).— ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮೊದಲು ಈಗಿನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ, ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ಮತ್ತು ಹಣದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ವಿಚಾರ—ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅತ್ಯಗತ್ಯ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಹಣದ ಅಭಾವದಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅನೇಕ ಕಾರ್ಯ

ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳದೇ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕಳೆದ ಸಾಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಜೂರಾದ ಬಹಳ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಈ ವರ್ಷ ಸಹ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾವು ಭಾವಿಸಬಹುದು. ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ರಚನೆಯಾಗಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕೇಂದ್ರೀಕೃತವಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಅದೂ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗೂ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಲಭಿಸುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮೊದಲು ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಪಾದರೂ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗ—ಪಟ್ಟಣಗ, ಒಡವ—ಬಿಲ್ಲದ ಎಂಬ ಭೇದಭಾವವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಮಸ್ತರಿಗೂ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾರ್ಥಕವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇದೇ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಹಲವಾರು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಈಗಿರುವ ಹಣದ ಅಭಾವದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ವೆಚ್ಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಬದಲು ಅದೇ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವುಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ನೂಕುವಾದುದು.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ rent collection ವಿಚಾರ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿರುವುದು ವಿಷಾದಕರ. ಈಗ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 4-5 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಿ ಬಡ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಆತನಿಗೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಆ ಮನೆ ಧನಿಕರ ಪಾಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂದರೆ, ಈ rent collection ಎಂಬುದು ಆಯಾ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ರೈತನಿಗೂ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುವುದರ ಬದಲು ಇದೇ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿರುವ ಇತರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಅಂದರೆ, ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್, ಹೌಸ್ ಬ್ಲಾಂಕ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಮುಂತಾದವಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯ—ಸಹಕಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಗೆ ಹಣದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗುವವರೆಗೆ ಕೈ ಹಾಕದೆ ಇರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for the day and meet again to-morrow at 12 NOON.

The House adjourned for the day at Five Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet again at Twelve of the Clock on Friday, the 16th April 1954.